

FINANCING

Photo by Kathleen Goodwin

10. FINANCING

STATE IRWM REQUIREMENTS: K. Financing. Identify beneficiaries and identify potential funding/financing for Plan implementation. Discuss ongoing support and financing for operation and maintenance of implemented projects.

10-1 IMPLEMENTATION FUNDING



The ICWMP will be implemented through project-specific implementation and overall Plan administration by the TBWC. Project costs and funding matches, where known, are summarized on Table 10-1. These projects (excluding the MMWD's regional water supply projects) total approximately \$41,000,000. The short-term project priorities identified in Chapter 5 represent approximately \$9,500,000 of this total amount.

Funding for most capital improvement projects includes some reserves by public water agencies and public utility districts. However, full funding has not been assured, and for other projects funding is largely dependent on receipt of government or private grants. Few of the project proponents have the ability to generate revenues of sufficient magnitude to implement identified projects within their resources, especially non-governmental organizations.

At this time (July 2007), the TBWC plans to submit a Proposition 50, Round 2, Step 1 grant application requesting funding for some of this Plan's short-term priorities. In the immediate future other potential funding sources include Proposition 84, which was passed by California voters in 2006. Proposition 84 provides funds for planning and implementation of critical water resource management facilities and programs. Other state, federal and private grant funding sources will be pursued.

Many of the stakeholders in the TBWC have worked effectively in the past to solicit and receive government and grant funding for a variety of key projects. In addition, many of the project proponents have secured some matching funds for the projects identified in the ICWMP. Other

known matching funds include: State Coastal Conservancy funding, California Department of Fish and Game funding, federal Community Development Block Grant, and private grant funds, as well as agency contributions. Public agency project proponents largely have a matching fund component (i.e., County of Marin and National Park Service). MMWD also provides a portion of matching funds to several sediment reduction and watershed projects.

The agencies and organizations in the region have a collective demonstrated ability to obtain grant money and other investment of resources.. Public and private dollars already have been invested in the Tomales Bay region, and this plan further protects investment made to date. In the past 20 years, millions of dollars have been received by stakeholder groups in the region to implement water quality, ecosystem restoration, water supply, and stormwater/flood management projects and programs. There has also been a lot of volunteer support with project implementation that is expected to continue.

Water supply and infrastructure capital improvement matching funds will largely be provided through agency capital improvement funds. For example, the NMWD's Point Reyes Station water supply wells and treatment plant improvements have allocated 50% matching funds to both projects from the District's Capital Improvement Plan. Capital reserve funds also are budgeted for portions of IPUD and TVCSD projects. State grants and loans are funding sources for the smaller water agencies that are often sought to supplement agency revenue and user fees.

10-2 ONGOING O&M SUPPORT AND FINANCING

Ongoing operations and maintenance of constructed capital improvements would be funded through existing agency revenues and user fees. Most of the proposed facility construction (except for MMWD's regional projects) consist of minor additions, replacements, or treatment additions, which would not result in a significant increase in staff or maintenance requirements. Operations and maintenance for these facilities would be within existing agency O&M costs. Most project proponents have conducted these types of projects in the past and are committed to a 10-year maintenance schedule. It is anticipated that costs and requirements for maintenance will be met.

Other ICWMP projects consist of habitat restoration and/or minor land or stream improvements, which would not result in significant ongoing O&M costs. In some cases, projects that remove culverts and fish barriers could remove some future maintenance and associated costs with clearing culverts and/or removal of jammed debris from streams and fish stocking costs.

In some cases, there is maintenance associated with stream projects, which can be subject to flooding and post-storm maintenance. Agricultural BMP implementation requires maintenance and/or monitoring—i.e., when fencing is installed, weed management and fence repair becomes new costs for private landowners.

10-3 BENEFICIARIES

Several groups will benefit from implementation of the ICWMP. The first is clearly the residents of the Tomales Bay area, who would benefit from improvements to water supply and treatment systems, as well as improvements to make these systems less vulnerable to service disruption during natural disasters and emergencies. The second group of beneficiaries would be all the “beneficial uses,” including mariculture operators and fish and wildlife resources that would benefit from improved water quality, and habitat improvements in the case of fish and wildlife resources, including over two dozen threatened and endangered species. Third, the public agencies empowered with implementing state plans (i.e., coho recovery, TMDL targets) would benefit from the ongoing implementation, evaluation and assessment of how the ICWMP is contributing to achieving targets or implementing projects outlined in these studies.

Last, beneficiaries of Plan implementation also include current and future generations of residents and visitors, including recreational users in the greater San Francisco Bay region and elsewhere that are part of the approximate 2.5 million visitors to the area annually. The improvement of public trust lands within an area that receives regional, state and international recognition will further protect the investments made to date in the Tomales Bay region.

**TABLE 10-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT FUNDING**

| ID # | PROJECT | Cost | Funding Match | Matching Funds |
|-------------|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | NMWD-Gallagher Wells & Pipeline | 800,000 | 800,000 | 50% |
| 2 | NMWD-Pt. Reyes Water Treatment Improvements | 1,250,000 | 1,250,000 | 50% |
| 3 | MMWD-Desalination Plant | | | TBD |
| 4 | MMWD-Mt. Tamalpais Roads & Trails Management | 4,000,000 | | |
| 5 | MMWD-Peacock Gap Recycled Water Extension | | | |
| 6 | MMWD-Watershed Assessment Program | 220,000 | 75,000 | 25% |
| 7 | MMWD-Mercury Monitoring Program | | | |
| 8 | MMWD-Groundwater Recovery Feasibility Study-Phase 2 | 180,000 | | |
| 9 | MMWD-Lagunitas Creek Riparian Vegetation Work | 200,000 | | TBD |
| 10 | MMWD- Rainwater Capture & Stormwater Use Project | | | |
| 11 | MMED-Lagunitas Creek Roads MOU Implement Sediment Reduction | 300,000 | 50,000 | 17% |
| 12 | MMWD-Lagunitas Creek Roads MOU Implementation Assessment and Inventory | 175,000 | 20,000 | 10% |
| 13 | MMWD-Water System Security and Emergency Preparedness | 250,000 | | TBD |
| 14 | MMWD-Soulajule Reservoir Supply to Stafford Lake WTP | 5,000,000 | | |
| 15 | MMWD-Water Conservation: Sustainable Wildland Landscape | | | |
| 16 | MMWD-Water Conservation: Marin County Satellite Imagery Project | | | |
| 17 | MMWD-Pipeline and Tank Access Road Stormwater Improvements | 200,000 | 70,000 | 25% |
| 18 | MMWD-Fencing Around MMWD Water Supply Reservoirs | 480,000 | 170,000 | 25% |
| 19 | MMWD-Inkwells/Shafter Bridge Crossing Project: Planning | 35,000 | | |
| 20 | MMWD-Inkwells/Shafter Bridge Crossing Project: Construction | 350,000 | | TBD |
| 21 | MMWD-Invasive Aquatic Weed Management Program | | | TBD |
| 22 | RCD-Rancher Outreach Program | 60,000 | 45,000 | 43% |
| 23 | TU-Dickson Weir & Equestrian Facility Study | 25,000 | | TBD |
| 24 | MCPW-Arroyo Creek Fish Passage Restoration | 400,000 | 50,000 | 11% |
| 25 | MCPW-East Fork Woodacre #2 Fish Passage Restoration | 175,000 | 50,000 | 50% |
| 26 | MCPW-San Geronimo Creek Fish Passage Restoration | 250,000 | 50,000 | 20% |
| 27 | MCPW- Woodacre Creek #3 Fish Passage Restoration | 400,000 | 50,000 | 12.50% |
| 28 | MCPW-Kent Canyon Creek Fish Passage Restoration | 400,000 | 50,000 | 12.50% |
| 29 | MCPW-Marin County Watershed Management Plan | 50,000 | 10,000 | 20% |
| 30 | MCPW-Silver Hills Creek Restoration Project | 65,000 | 10,000 | 15% |
| 31 | NPS-Duxbury Reef Reserve Restoration | 575,000 | 57,500 | 10% |
| 32 | NPS-Pt. Reyes Headlands Reserve Restoration | 225,000 | | TBD |
| 33 | NPS-Tomales Bay Boat Removal | 150,000 | | |
| 34 | NPS-Tomales Bay Vessel Management Plan Implementation | 225,000 | | |
| 35 | NPS-Olema Valley Trail Reroute & Stream Crossing Replacement | 300,000 | | |
| 36 | NPS-Stewart Horse Camp Septic Replacement | 143,000 | | |
| 37 | NPS-Devils Gulch Road/Trail Sediment Control | 334,000 | | |
| 38 | NPS-Tomas Bay Beach Campground Access & Restroom Improvements | 152,900 | | |
| 39 | CPR-Hearts Desire Beach Restroom Leach Line Replacement | 400,000 | | TBD |

**TABLE 10-1
SUMMARY OF PROJECT FUNDING**

| ID # | PROJECT | Cost | Funding Match | Matching Funds |
|---|---|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 40 | TBWC-Chicken Ranch Beach Restoration | 140,000 | 15,000 | 11% |
| 41 | IPUD-Climate Change Assessment | 40,000 | | |
| 42 | RWQCB-Nicasio & Soulajoule Reservoir Management | | | |
| 43 | RWQCB-Stormwater, Flood Management & Instream Flow Enhancement | | | |
| 44 | RWQCB-Lagunitas Creek Watershed Sediment Reduction & Habitat Enhancement | | | |
| 45 | RWQCB-Riparian Zone & Large Woody Debris Enhancement | | | |
| 46 | SPAWN-Lagunitas Creek Watershed Restoration Program for Private Lands, Bioengineered Bank Repairs | 650,000 | 65,000 | 10-15% |
| 47 | SPAWN-Lagunitas Creek Watershed Restoration - Road Repairs | 350,000 | 70,000 | 10-20% |
| 48 | SPAWN-Salmonid Monitoring | 17,400 | | |
| 49 | SPAWN-Lagunitas Creek Stormwater Initiative | 120,000 | 18,000 | 15% |
| 50 | BCPUD-Treatment Microfiltration Unit | 275,000 | | |
| 51 | BCPUD-Olema-Bolinas Road Water Main Upgrade | 500,000 | | |
| 52 | BCPUD-Disinfection Byproduct Treatment Facility | 660,000 | | |
| 53 | BCPUD-Water Storage Capacity Expansion | 1,400,000 | | |
| 54 | BCPUD-Invasive Reed Removal | 250,000 | | |
| 55 | BCPUD-Distribution Pipeline Replacement | 2,500,000 | | |
| 56 | BCPUD-Surfer's Overlook Water Main Relocation | 750,000 | | |
| 57 | TVCSD-Tertiary Treatment & Recycling Planning Study | 79,800 | 39,000 | 50% |
| 58 | TVCSD-Tertiary Treatment & Recycling Project | 360,000 | 36,000 | 10% |
| 59 | East Shore Group - Wastewater Upgrade | 2,000,000 | | |
| 60 | NMWD-Emergency Pipeline Across SA Fault | 150,000 | | ?? |
| 61 | RCD-Habitat Improvement Project Implementation | 500,000 | 125,000 | 25% |
| 62 | RCD-Ag Land Renewal Energy Proposal | 5,000,000 | 1,250,000 | 25% |
| 63 | RCD-Coastal Prairie Improvement | 500,000 | 125,000 | 25% |
| 64 | NPS-Grazing BMPs | 400,000 | 200,000 | 50% |
| 65 | IPUD-Treatment Disinfection Byproducts | 500,000 | 125,000 | 25% |
| 66 | IPUD-Distribution Pipeline Replacement | 40,000 | 8,000 | 20% |
| 67 | IPUD-Asset Management Plan | 10,000 | 2,000 | 20% |
| 68 | IPUD-Conservation Program | 10,000 | 1,000 | 10% |
| 69 | IPUD-Treated Water Storage Expansion | 300,000 | 150,000 | 50% |
| 70 | MCOSD- San Geronimo Road/Trail Sediment Reduction | 700,000 | 105,000 | 15% |
| 71 | MCPW- Duxbury Reef Stormwater Quality ASBS | 150,000 | 22,500 | 15% |
| 72 | MALT-Ag Land Conservation Easement Acquisition | 4,290,000 | 2,831,400 | 66% |
| 73 | MMWD-Invasive Weed Management | 50,000 | | |
| 74 | NPS-Riparian Restoration | 250,000 | 125,000 | 50% |
| NOTE: Matching fund determination is underway for those projects with yet unspecified matching fund amounts. | | | | |
| TOTAL COSTS | | \$ 40,712,100 | 6,871,300 | |